

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

<b>ROBERT FREEMAN, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiffs,</b>	)	
	)	<b>No. 3:12-cv-00266</b>
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	<b>Judge Sharp</b>
<b>SONYA TROUTT, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	)	<b>Magistrate Judge Knowles</b>
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiffs Robert Freeman, Johnny Davis, Billy Dishman, and Labron Luke, inmates (or former inmates) at the Sumner County Jail, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, have filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Sonya Troutt, Sonny Weatherford, and Southern Health Partners.<sup>1</sup> On October 30, 2013, Defendant Southern Health Partners filed a motion for summary judgment. (Docket Entry No. 103). Plaintiffs filed no response in opposition.

The Magistrate Judge entered a Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) (Docket Entry No. 120) in this case on February 26, 2014, concluding,

As an initial matter, it is undisputed that no policy, practice, action, or inaction of SHP or its employees has caused any injury to Plaintiffs. *Souders Aff.*, ¶ 22. For this reason alone, Plaintiffs’ cannot prevail against Defendant SHP on their § 1983 claims, and Defendant SHP is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law.

Moreover, it is undisputed that Plaintiffs have received medical attention in response to every Sick Call request slip they have submitted, for every medical complaint they have made. *Id.*, ¶ 20. Additionally, Plaintiffs have adduced no evidence that they suffered from any serious medical need. Accordingly, Plaintiffs cannot establish that Defendant SHP was deliberately indifferent to their serious medical needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants Chassity Pilcher and Mahailiah Hughes were dismissed by previous Order entered on June 20, 2012. *See* (Docket Entry No. 31).

Therefore, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the motion for summary judgment “be GRANTED.” (*Id.* at 14). No objections were made to the R & R.

Where no objections are made to the R & R, “[t]he district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Having thoroughly reviewed the record in this case and the applicable law in accordance with Rule 72(b), the Court will accept the R & R.

Accordingly, the Court hereby rules as follows:

(1) The Report and Recommendation (Docket Entry No. 120) is hereby ACCEPTED and APPROVED;

(2) *Defendant Southern Health Partners’ Motion for Summary Judgment* (Docket Entry No. 103) is hereby GRANTED; and

(3) Defendant Southern Health Partners<sup>2</sup> is hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

**It is SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KEVIN H. SHARP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs’ Complaint incorrectly names “Southern Healthcare” as a Defendant. “Southern Healthcare” actually refers to Southern Health Partners.